



Texas Department of Insurance

Division of Workers' Compensation

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645

518-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • www.tdi.texas.gov

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address

VISTA MEDICAL CENTER HOSPITAL
4301 VISTA ROAD
PASADENA, TX 77503

DWC Claim #:

Injured Employee:

Date of Injury:

Employer Name:

Insurance Carrier #:

Respondent Name

TARGET CORP

Carrier's Austin Representative Box

BOX NUMBER 39

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-04-7873-01

MFDR Date Received

MARCH 23, 2004

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary Dated April 16, 2004: "The Carrier is allowed to deduct any personal items and may only deduct non-documented services and items and services, which are not related to the compensable injury. At that time, if the total audited charges *for the entire admission* are below \$40,000, the Carrier may reimburse at a "per diem" rate for the hospital services. However, if the total audited charges *for the entire admission* are at or above \$40,000, the Carrier shall reimburse using the "Stop-Loss Reimbursement Factor" (SLRF). The SLRF of 75% is applied to the "entire admission."

Requestor's Supplemental Position Summary Dated November 10, 2011: "Please allow this letter to serve as a supplemental statement to Vista's originally submitted request for dispute resolution in consideration of the Texas Third Court of Appeal's Final Judgment..."

Amount in Dispute: \$10,833.27

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary Dated April 7, 2004: "The facts are that the provided {sic} billed the Carrier \$80,438.87 of which Carrier paid \$39,128.79. Carrier cannot determine where the provider obtained the figures used in their TWCC-60 or why they are put forward. Given a correct understanding of the facts, this is a "stop-loss" case and Requestor has not shown entitlement to this alternative, exceptional method of calculating reimbursement and has not otherwise properly calculated the audited charges. Medical bills in excess of \$40,000 do not automatically qualify for stop-loss reimbursement. Rather, the per diem rate is the default and preferred method of reimbursement that must be employed unless the hospital justifies use of the stop-loss method in a particular case. The stop-loss methodology may be allowed, but only if the \$40,000 threshold of "audited charges" is exceeded and then only "on a case-by-case" basis. Here, the initial \$40,000 threshold has **not** been exceeded. The "total charges" less "deducted charges" (including personal items, undocumented services, services unrelated to the compensable injury, duplicative charges, upcoded services, unbundled services, implantables, orthotics, prosthetics and pharmaceuticals in excess of \$250 per dose), results in "audited charges" which do not exceed \$40,000. Cost-plus reimbursement for the above-referenced services is applicable as such are included in "deducted charges". Even if the initial \$40,000 threshold of "audited charges" was exceeded,

Requestor has not proven entitlement to any exception to the preferred per diem method. Such proof requires Requestor to show the services provided were **unusually extensive and unusually costly** for the subject admission. Requestor has failed to sustain the burden of proving that exception. In the absence of or insufficiency of such evidence, the preferred/default method of reimbursement is the per diem method.”

Response Submitted by: Flahive, Ogden & Latson

Respondent’s Supplemental Position Summary Dated May 4, 2004: “This letter is filed as a supplemental response to the Request for Medical Dispute resolution requested by Vista Center Hospital. Carrier has previously responded to this dispute on 4/7/2004. The provider has not submitted additional pertinent information and the carrier position remains the same.”

Response Submitted by: Flahive, Ogden & Latson

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Disputed Dates	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
June 23, 2003 through June 26, 2003	Inpatient Hospital Services	\$10,833.27	\$0.00

FINDINGS AND DECISION

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers’ Compensation.

Background

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.304, 17 *Texas Register* 1105, effective February 20, 1992, amended effective July 15, 2000 sets out the procedures for medical payments and denials.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.305 and §133.307, 27 *Texas Register* 12282, applicable to requests filed on or after January 1, 2003, sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, 22 *Texas Register* 6264, effective August 1, 1997, sets out the fee guidelines for inpatient services rendered in an acute care hospital.

The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:

Explanation of Benefits

- M – Reimbursed per the insurance carrier’s fair and reasonable allowance.
- M – Bill was reimbursed per the Insurance Carrier’s Fair and Reasonable allowance.

Issues

1. Did the audited charges exceed \$40,000.00?
2. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually extensive services?
3. Did the admission in dispute involve unusually costly services?
4. Is the requestor entitled to additional reimbursement?

Findings

This dispute relates to inpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401, titled *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline*, effective August 1, 1997, 22 Texas Register 6264. The Third Court of Appeals’ November 13, 2008 opinion in *Texas Mutual Insurance Company v. Vista Community Medical Center, LLP*, 275 South Western Reporter Third 538, 550 (Texas Appeals – Austin 2008, petition denied) addressed a challenge to the interpretation of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401. The Court concluded that “to be eligible for reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception, a hospital must demonstrate that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000 and that an admission involved unusually costly and unusually extensive services.” Both the requestor and respondent in this case were notified via form letter that the mandate for the decision cited above was issued on January 19, 2011. Each party was given the opportunity to supplement their original MDR submission, position or response as applicable. The division received supplemental information as noted in the position summaries above. The documentation filed by the requestor and respondent to date is considered.

Consistent with the Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion, the division will address whether the total audited charges **in this case** exceed \$40,000; whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually extensive; and whether the admission and disputed services **in this case** are unusually costly. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(2)(C) states, in pertinent part, that "Independent reimbursement is allowed on a case-by-case basis if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold as described in paragraph (6) of this subsection..." 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) puts forth the requirements to meet the three factors that will be discussed.

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6)(A)(i) states "...to be eligible for stop-loss payment the total audited charges for a hospital admission must exceed \$40,000, the minimum stop-loss threshold." Furthermore, (A) (v) of that same section states "...Audited charges are those charges which remain after a bill review by the insurance carrier has been performed..." Review of the explanation of benefits issued by the carrier finds that the carrier did not deduct any charges in accordance with §134.401(c)(6)(A)(v); therefore the audited charges equal \$80,438.87. The Division concludes that the total audited charges exceed \$40,000.
2. The requestor in its original position statement asserts that "...if the total audited charges *for the entire admission* are below \$40,000, the Carrier may reimburse at a "per diem" rate for the hospital services. However, if the total audited charges *for the entire admission* are at or above \$40,000, the Carrier shall reimburse using the Stop-Loss Reimbursement Factor" (SLRF). The SLRF of 75% is applied to the "entire admission." As noted above, the Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion in *Texas Mutual Insurance Company v. Vista Community Medical Center, LLP*, 275 South Western Reporter Third 538, 550 (Texas Appeals – Austin 2008, petition denied) rendered judgment to the contrary. In its supplemental position statement, the requestor considered the Courts' final judgment and opined on both rule requirements. In regards to whether the services were unusually extensive, the Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion concluded that in order to be eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss exception, a hospital must demonstrate that an admission involved unusually extensive services. Rule §134.401(c)(2)(C) allows for payment under the stop-loss exception on a case-by-case basis only if the particular case exceeds the stop-loss threshold as described in paragraph (6). Paragraph (6)(A)(ii) states that "This stop-loss threshold is established to ensure compensation for unusually extensive services required during an admission." The requestor's supplemental position statement asserts that:

"The medical records on file with MDR show this admission to be a complex spine surgery which is unusually extensive for at least two reasons; first, this type of surgery is unusually extensive when compared to all surgeries performed on workers' compensation patients in that only 19% of such surgeries involved operations on the spine; second, this type of surgery requires additional, trained nursing staff and specialized equipment (such as the operating table) thereby making the hospital services unusually extensive. Finally, any evidence of comorbidities, which should be considered, is part of the medical records, which have been previously filed."

The requestor's categorization of spinal surgeries presupposes that all spinal surgeries are unusually extensive for the specified reasons. The requestor did not submit documentation to support the reasons asserted, nor did the requestor point to any sources for the information presented. The reasons stated are therefore not demonstrated. Additionally, the requestor's position that all spinal surgeries are unusually extensive does not satisfy §134.401(c)(2)(C) which requires application of the stop-loss exception on a case-by-case basis. The Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion affirmed this, stating "The rule further states that independent reimbursement under the Stop-Loss Exception will be 'allowed on a case-by-case basis.' *Id.* §134.401(c)(2)(C). This language suggests that the Stop-Loss Exception was meant to apply on a case-by-case basis in relatively few cases." The requestor's position that all spine surgeries are unusually extensive fails to meet the requirements of §134.401(c)(2)(C) because the particulars of the services in dispute are not discussed, nor does the requestor demonstrate how the services in dispute were unusually extensive in relation to similar spinal surgery services or admissions. For the reasons stated, the division finds that the requestor failed to demonstrate that the services in dispute were unusually extensive.

3. In regards to whether the services were unusually costly, the Third Court of Appeals' November 13, 2008 opinion concluded that in order to be eligible for reimbursement under the stop-loss exception, a hospital must demonstrate that an admission involved unusually costly services. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6) states that "Stop-loss is an independent reimbursement methodology established to ensure fair and reasonable compensation to the hospital for unusually costly services rendered during treatment to an injured worker." The requestor's supplemental position statement asserts that:

"The medical and billing records on file with MDR also show that this admission was unusually costly for two reasons: first the median charge for all workers' compensation inpatient surgeries is \$23,187; the median charge for workers' compensation surgeries of this type is \$39,000; therefore the audited billed charges for this surgery substantially exceed not only the median charges, but also the \$40,000 stop-loss

threshold; second, as mentioned in the preceding paragraph, in order for this surgery to be performed, specialized equipment and specially trained, extra nursing staff were required, thereby adding substantially to the cost of surgery in comparison to other types of surgeries; and third, it was necessary to purchase expensive implants for use in the surgery.

The requestor asserts that because the **billed charges** exceed the stop-loss threshold, the admission in this case is unusually costly. The Division notes that audited charges are addressed as a separate and distinct factor described in 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(6)(A)(i). Billed charges for services do not represent the cost of providing those services, and no such relation has been established in the instant case. The requestor fails to demonstrate that the **costs** associated with the services in dispute are unusual when compared to similar spinal surgery services or admissions. For that reason, the division rejects the requestor's position that the admission is unusually costly based on the mere fact that the billed or audited charges "substantially" exceed \$40,000. The requestor additionally asserts that certain resources that are used for the types of surgeries associated with the admission in dispute (i.e. specialized equipment and specially-trained, extra nursing staff) added substantially to the cost of the admission. The requestor does not list or quantify the costs associated with these resources in relation to the disputed services, nor does the requestor provide documentation to support a reasonable comparison between the resources required for the comparison surgeries. Therefore, the requestor fails to demonstrate that the hospital's resources used in this particular admission are unusually costly when compared to the hospital's resources used in other types of surgeries.

4. For the reasons stated above the services in dispute are not eligible for the stop-loss method of reimbursement. Consequently, reimbursement shall be calculated pursuant to 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount* and §134.401(c)(4) titled *Additional Reimbursements*. The Division notes that additional reimbursements under §134.401(c)(4) apply only to bills that do not reach the stop-loss threshold described in subsection (c)(6) of this section.
 - Review of the submitted documentation finds that the services provided were surgical; therefore the standard per diem amount of \$1,118.00 per day applies. Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(3)(ii) states, in pertinent part, that "The applicable Workers' Compensation Standard Per Diem Amount (SPDA) is multiplied by the length of stay (LOS) for admission..." The length of stay was three days. The surgical per diem rate of \$1,118 multiplied by the length of stay of three days results in an allowable amount of \$3,354.00.
 - 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(4)(C) states "Pharmaceuticals administered during the admission and greater than \$250 charged per dose shall be reimbursed at cost to the hospital plus 10%. Dose is the amount of a drug or other substance to be administered at one time." A review of the submitted itemized statement finds that the requestor billed one unit of Tobramycin 1.2GM Pow at \$1,708.55/unit, for a total charge of \$1,708.55 and two units of Dilaudid PCA 100ML at \$289.00/unit, for a total charge of \$578.00. The requestor did not submit documentation to support what the cost to the hospital was for Tobramycin 1.2GM Pow and Dilaudid PCA 100ML. For that reason, reimbursement for these items cannot be recommended.

The division concludes that the total allowable for this admission is \$3,354.00. The respondent issued payment in the amount of \$39,128.79. Based upon the documentation submitted, no additional reimbursement can be recommended.

Conclusion

The submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The requestor in this case demonstrated that the audited charges exceed \$40,000, but failed to demonstrate that the disputed inpatient hospital admission involved unusually extensive services, and failed to demonstrate that the services in dispute were unusually costly. Consequently, 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.401(c)(1) titled *Standard Per Diem Amount*, and §134.401(c)(4) titled *Additional Reimbursements* are applied and result in no additional reimbursement.

ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the division has determined that the requestor is entitled to \$0.00 reimbursement for the disputed services.

Authorized Signature

Signature

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer

September 20, 2012
Date

YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute may appeal this decision by requesting a contested case hearing. A completed **Request for a Medical Contested Case Hearing** (form **DWC045A**) must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the Division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision* together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party.****

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.